

Interview Summary	Application N .	Applicant(s)	
	10/092,683	CHENG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mitchell	2807	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) SPE Cuneo (3) _____
 (2) Mr. Berger (4) _____

Date of Interview: 12 September 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all, in general.

Identification of prior art discussed: jp reference used in rejection.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

KAMAND CUNEO
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Berger described that the rejection under the jp reference was in error because the projections 25 relied upon as terminals cannot reasonably be interpreted as terminals in light of the specification. He explained that terminals as disclosed are connection points as described. The projections are merely projections for the purpose of securing the encapsulant and do not make any electrical connections. As such, there are not two rows of terminals as claimed. Further, if the projections are considered the terminals, the rejection of claim 3 is improper, because claim 3 recites further projections. In summary, in view of applicant's description of terminals and the jp reference's explanation of what projections (25) are, it is unreasonable to construe them as terminals. Mr. Berger also inquired about the 112 rejection. He explained that the leads extended beyond the ring, and the perimeter of the ring was defined by the ring itself and not the outermost part of the leads. Cuneo requested that Mr. Berger file these arguments and final determination will be made when the arguments are received. Notwithstanding, the explanations regarding the 112 rejection may be sufficient to overcome this rejection, and the arguments regarding the terminals may be considered persuasive.